

REMARKS

Claims 51-69 are pending in this application. Claims 30-50 are canceled, and claims 51-69 are added.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor for the courtesy extended during the in-person interview on January 17, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner and applicant's representative discussed applicant's techniques and the cited references. In addition, the Examiner and applicant's representative agreed on several amendments to the claims. Due to the extensive nature of the amendments, applicant provides a new set of claims implementing the amendments discussed.

The Examiner has rejected claims 30-33, 35, 38-41, 43, and 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Shambroom and Wood; and rejected claims 34, 36-37, 42, 44-45, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Shambroom, Wood, and applicant admitted prior art. Although applicant disagrees, applicant has amended the claims as discussed during the interview.

Claim Amendments

As discussed during the interview, applicant has amended the independent claims, now claims 51 and 65, to recite the "receiving" step prior to the "storing" step.

Moreover, applicant has provided in the independent claims that the server authenticates the first client computer system and the second client computer system using different authentication mechanisms. The cited art of Shambroom does not teach or suggest this feature of the claims since the key distribution center of Shambroom must use a key authentication mechanism for each connecting computer.

Under applicant's techniques, each authentication mechanism may specify a different "type of information" that will be necessary to authenticate (i.e., verify the purported identity of) a client computer system or entity according to that authentication

mechanism. For example, the type of information specified by a basic HTTP authentication mechanism may be a password of a client computer system or entity. The type of information specified by a digest authentication mechanism may be a digest formed by hashing a series of numbers associated with a client computer system or entity. The type of information specified by an NTLM authentication mechanism may be credentials including a user name and encrypted password of a client computer system or entity. Dependent claims 55-58 and 61-64 recite the types of information specified by each of these recited authentication mechanisms. Under applicant's techniques, when a client computer system or entity requests access to a service of a server computer system, the client computer system or entity provides "information of the type specified by the authentication mechanism" that has been selected for that client computer system or entity.

Also as discussed during the interview, applicant has amended the claims to further incorporate the language "a type of information necessary to verify a purported identity of a client computer system [or an entity]" into the body of the claims. Although applicant maintains that it is not necessary to patentability, applicant has provided independent claims 51, 59, and 65 to recite the language "the first authentication mechanism specifying at least one first type of information necessary to verify a first purported identity of the first client computer system, the first client computer system having client-specific knowledge of the information necessary to verify the first purported identity of the first client computer system" in the body of the claims.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268758US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 3-3-08

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant